DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 606 CS 203 926

AUTHOR Thurston, Carol M.
TITLE Trends in Media Criticism and Accountability in Western Europe: Growing Pressure from Consumers.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (59th, College Park, Maryland, August 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analytical Criticism; Codes of Ethics; Foreign Countries; *Freedom of Speech; *Information Needs; *Mass Media; National Organizations; *News Media; News Reporting; Ombudsmen; *Public Opinion; *Social Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS *Europe

ABSTRACT

This paper examines efforts in Western Europe to monitor and guide the performance of the mass media. The evidence indicates that consumers are increasing their efforts to let the media know their wants and needs; these efforts include complaints to national press councils and action in special-interest groups. Local and federal governments have responded to public opinion by creating press councils or by modifying existing councils, appointing ombudspersons, and establishing codes of ethics or independent regulatory agencies. The report concludes with the hope that these developments will soon lead to a balance among press rights, human rights, and information needs, without the loss of any of these rights. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED150606

TRENDS IN MEDIA CRITICISM AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN WESTERN EUROPE: GROWING PRESSURE FROM CONSUMERS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol M. Thurston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CAROL M. THURSTON*

1976 James W. Markham Student Paper Competition
International Communication Division
Association for Education in Journalism

SECOND PLACE AWARD

*Doctoral student in international communication, Department of Journalism, School of Communication, The University of Texas at Austin. The author wishes to thank Professor Donald Wright for helpful suggestions and support.

CS203926

In delineating some directions for future research in mass communication, Davison and Yu suggest that researchers examine methods of self-regulation, the effects of competition, and ways audiences can bring pressure on the disseminators of information and entertainment; and that the answer to how media standards can be achieved depends both on being able to determine the needs of individuals and groups and the ways mass communication can help satisfy those needs, and what media and types of content are best for achieving that need satisfaction. (W. Phillips Davison and Frederick T. C. Yu, "Some Priority Areas for Future Research," in Davison and Yu, eds., Mass Communication Research: Major Issues and Future Directions. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974. pp. 184-196.) Some presently existing mechanisms for self-regulation and accountability in the mass media of Western Europe and the pressures exerted by consumers on those mechanisms are examined here.

INTRODUCTION

The debate between a free press and responsible press performance has intensified in recent years, largely due to technological developments in information gathering and transmission, and economic conditions that have resulted in some cases in limiting the variety of expressed viewpoints, and in others in government intervention in the form of subsidies, in attempts to sustain that variety. Public opinion, consumer action and media initiated regulation and criticism, such as journalism reviews, codes of ethics and press councils, have been mechanisms for achieving the goal of balance, fairness and ethical behavior in the mass media of the free press countries.

Recent changes in the structures and mechanisms for arbitrating the performance of mass media in Western Europe indicate that the consumer is in-

creasingly making his wants and needs known to the media, through individual action in some cases, as in complaints to press councils, but also through interest groups, a euphemism for the organizations that represent the interests resident in any given population. This pressure is felt particularly within the local and federal political bodies, which appear to be ever ready to bring forward legislative disciplinary action. Existing press councils have been modified and new councils have been created in response to felt pressures, the press ombudsman has entered the picture, ethical codes have been adopted in countries where they previously did not exist, and some entirely new regulatory-advisory bodies have appeared in the broadcast media. Indications that pressure is being felt elsewhere can be seen in the discussions and expressed intentions for setting up such bodies in still more countries.

John Merrill, reporting on a recent extended visit in Europe, said "the climate of opinion among average citizens--and even among journalists--of Europe appears to be shifting to accommodate more outside control of the press in order to make various journalistic systems more responsible to their societies."[1]

To date, most attention to the quality of media performance has been directed to the confrontation between the free press and government controls, but concern about the control that ownership exercises over what goes into the mass media is growing in pace with the advance of concentration of ownership in the press, although still receiving less attention than threatened government controls.

The movements to change the conditions under which the press (print and broadcast) operates and to create greater responsibility in performance takes two major directions: 1) to restrain "sensational" reporting, which is equated with invasion of privacy; and 2) to insure "objectivity" and "imparti-

ality" in all cases. About the latter subject there is much opinion, both strong and mixed. Fairness is usually equated with balance, but there are at least two kinds of balance--that relating to the amount of attention or lack of it, and the other to the kind of attention given a topic. There is the view that interpretive reporting is necessary in order to adequately inform, that daily short reporting of facts and events cannot pull together the information necessary to provide adequate understanding. This also brings up the question of providing context for reported information, which is essential for information passed from one country to another. Can context be anything but interpreted through the perceptions of the reporter?

Another view sees lack of opinion as leading to neutrality, a lack of controversial subjects and debate of those subjects. In this case, does an opinion press provide more "access" in terms of exposure of a variety of opinions? Objectivity as a legal charge to the media is seen by Paul Twaroch of the Austrian Broadcasting Company as producing a greater variety of opinion and therefore a better informed audience.

The debate about objective reporting is growing even in countries with so-called opinion presses, such as Sweden. In a 1973 discussion of press freedom, a Conservative member of the Swedish Parliament described the mass media in that country as having acquired "a new type of journalism, which many people regard as crude, brutalizing and, least of all, objective."[2] Lennart Gröll, the Swedish Press Ombudsman, responded by pointing out that over the past ten years the press in Sweden "has taken an interest in how leaders of industry run their firms, which annoys them," and also that he has received complaints from "local power holders" whose activities were being questioned or written about. Again we see coming to the fore the realization that it is as important to protect press freedom and freedom of information from powerful private interests as from government.

Analysis and reassessment are going on in essentially every Western European broadcast system. As the media have grown to saturate the environment over the years since World War II, so too has the feeling grown that these media are powerful influences in the lives of great masses of people, and therefore must be regulated to serve "good" and "public" purposes. From government are heard calls for media to serve society in their intended function as carriers of information and education. There are many indications that the broadcasting companies are trying to determine and to serve the needs and desires of their audiences--which largely means more, and more variety, in the forms of entertainment--while public officials want to see media serve "information" purposes. The latter view radio and television, particularly, as potent instruments for the education of the population, but seem to see this need satisfied only through informational kinds of programs. Broadcasting is criticized for its emphasis on entertainment, and very little recognition is given to the important and necessary function entertainment serves in our lives, or to its great potential as a tool for learning.

PRESS COUNCILS

In the classical constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of expression, that concept is formulated as a basic right of the individual. Through the international instruments adopted after World War II, however, freedom of expression has come to be interpreted as freedom of information, and the idea of a right to information emerges as a basic social right of the individual, allowing him a variety of information supplied by the mass media. Governments therefore are expected to take the necessary measures to ensure this right,

such as protection against press concentrations. But for a government to attempt to ensure the quality of the supply of information is seen as putting freedom of information itself in jeopardy. In the face of this dilemma press councils have come to be looked on as an important alternative for regulating the quality of the supply of information.

Press councils began to be established in the 1950s, following the Swedish example of 1916. Today councils exist in half the countries of Western Europe--Austria, Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and West Germany. All but one (Sweden) were created in response to threatened governmental action to regulate the press, but all are private and have been voluntarily set up by the media themselves. In all the countries of Western Europe in which press councils have been created this action has so far been successful in holding off threatened regulatory legislation.

Press councils generally have the dual function of both combating abuses of and protecting press freedom. In this sense they have followed the British example rather than the Swedish, but in practice the majority are more concerned with combating abuses than protection. Variations in the way they function are illustrated by the Swedish Council, which deals with abuses only, the British Press Council, which has been equally active in both areas; and the West German Council, which has given the greatest attention to representing the press in the consideration of press laws.

These councils are not just a substitute for the right of reply, for they exist in countries which have a legal right of reply also--Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland (radio and television only), Norway and Denmark--and they play an important role in countries with a powerful and concentrated press, such as Great Britain and West Germany. Press councils provide an appeal and arbitration mechanism for media consumers that is quicker and costs less to the user than a regular court of law. They also offer the possibility

for avoiding further publicity, especially in cases of invasion of privacy or libel, and do not demand that the burden of proof be furnished by the complainant.[3]

In addressing the opening of the Round Table on Press Councils in Stockholm in 1974, Giuseppe Vedovato, President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, expressed his belief that "Mass media now occupy such an important place in society that their use entails real risks which the press laws cannot guard against. Consequently, professional ethics have a new part to play and press councils have acquired a new importance as disinterested institutions pursuing aims, and as guardians of the general interest."[4]

When summarizing the Stockholm discussions, Lennart Gröll emphasized the growing recognition of the role of the consumer in media affairs, and cited the repeatedly expressed view of participants that there should be some form of consumer participation in council activities. This is borne out by the actions of several press councils in recent years: three countries (Great Britain, Norway and Sweden) have changed the composition of their councils to include representatives of the public, and two others of recent origin (the Netherlands and Finland) have had such members from the beginning. Denmark has one non-media member as its chairman and changes are expected to include the addition of consumer representatives in the near future. Only Austria and West Germany continue to have councils composed of professional members only.

Great Britain

The British Press Council, founded in 1953, was originally composed of 25 professional members. The revisions of 1963 changed the name and enlarged the membership to 31, with the chairman and one third of the membership being

non-media representatives. Another revision in 1974 made half the members and the chairman lay representatives. This Council probably has been the most active and successful in the world. It has had explicit and extensive objectives, which have produced research and reports on the state of the press in Britain, which in turn have influenced legislation, especially having to do with the economic state of the press and concentration of ownership. In addition, it receives about 400 complaints per year about press performance, and issues 40 to 50 decisions.

The British Council has gained the support and confidence of both the press and the public through demonstration of its fairness and usefulness. It has been able to make its existence and the availability of its services well-known through volunteered newspaper publicity, to both the Council and its findings. It is presently funded by press contributions amounting to about $100,000 per year, and some observers feel the Council's ability to fully carry out its goals will be limited in the future unless this support is increased.[5]

Sweden

Even in Sweden the most recent reforms in the Press Council were prompted by discussion of parliamentary action to discipline the press. The period leading up to the reforms of 1969 was characterized by increasingly intrusive reporting on the private lives of individuals, coupled with widespread discontent with the work of the Press Council; it was felt that poor journalistic practices were increasing but that few such breaches were being brought before the Council. The 1969 revisions included broadening the sanctions to include fines, adding two members to the Council to represent the public, and the creation of the Office of Press Ombudsman. The fines range from $200 to $600, increasing with the number of offenses. The first appointee and present Press Ombudsman (PO) is Lennart Gröll, a former assistant justice of the Court of Appeals. The PO hears and investigates complaints, passes recommendations

to the Council for action, and acts as prosecutor in cases before the Council. The number of complaints increased from 60 in the year before Gröll took office to 400 during his first year. One hundred were referred to the Council for action and most of the dismissed cases were the result of successful negotiation. Groll believes the existence of the PO creates a feeling of accessibility to the arbitrating mechanism on the part of the public, and that a specific person is more approachable than an anonymous council.[6]

Norway

The Norwegian Press Council has been active since 1928, but was revised in 1972, when its membership was changed from three representatives of the press to a total of seven members, two of whom represent the public. Sanctions were strengthened to require publication of its decisions in the newspapers concerned. The Council has lately considered about 60 complaints per year. It bases its decisions on three sets of guidelines: the Code of Honor of the Press (revised in 1966), the Editor's Code (1953), and Directives for Reportage of Legal Proceedings (revised in 1965).[7]

Finland

Finland has a recently organized Council for Mass Media (1968) founded by the journalists' and publishers' organizations and the Finnish Broadcasting Company. This Council has jurisdiction in all media, but like the Swedish Council is concerned only with complaints against media. It has a non-media chairman and twelve members, four each representing journalists, publishers and the public. There have been an increasing number of cases brought to the Council since 1973, and it is projected that more cases will be initiated by the Council itself in the future, and that more emphasis will be put on protection of the consumer. The Council membership may be less independent than it could be since the four lay members and the chairman are elected by the media

members of the Council, though there is discussion about changing this practice. Questions also may be in order about including this Council among those known to be independent of government, since it receives some government financial support, and looks toward increasing this support.[8]

The Netherlands

The Netherlands Press Council, established in 1960, is a revised version of the earlier Court of Honor of the Federation of Netherlands Journalists, and came into being as a result of a threatened disciplinary law. With the establishment of the new body the membership was changed to include two non-journalists, a chairman from the legal profession and two representatives of the media. The Council deals mainly with complaints about violations of press ethics, which may be brought only by the person affected, but may be lodged against any journalist regardless of media. In spite of these changes the Press Council has had moderate success, with only a small number of cases brought before it and with some journalists' organizations and newspapers refusing to cooperate with it. In 1970 a Commission was set up to study how the Council could be made more effective, but no agreement was reached on the proposals made in 1972, which included a recommendation for a press ombudsman. The Commission continues to date.

Denmark

The Danish Press Council is another which has had moderate success so far. Founded in 1964 with the limitation of considering only cases related to the reporting of crimes, the Council's scope was broadened in 1968 to include any kind of case. It has had less than the full support of the press. The journalists' union does not recognize the Council because they are not represented on it, and they are not represented because their request for representation equal to that of the editors was not met at the time the Council was organized. The Council is composed of three editors and a distinguished legal person

as chairman. It hears complaints from the papers and people concerned, and from third parties when it decides an important question is at issue. Decisions are to be published in the newspaper concerned, and if not they are released through the national news agency.

In 1974 a Commission was set up to study and make recommendations to improve Council participation. Press Council Chairman Helga Pedersen, a justice on the Danish Supreme Court, expects several changes to be accepted, among which are extending Council authority to include the periodical press, radio and television, giving the Council authority to initiate cases; equal representation of journalists and editors, with the chairman having the tie-breaking vote; and some strengthening of the sanctions. Mrs. Pedersen feels that both fines and the ability to recommend that a case be taken to a court of law should be considered as sanctions. The latter, she believes, would have great "preventive force" for combating abuses of press freedom.[9]

West Germany and Austria

The Press Councils of West Germany and Austria are composed entirely of representatives of the press. The West German Council began in 1956 with ten members, and during the intervening time has been enlarged to 20 members. It receives about 100 complaints per year from consumers and also functions as a lobby for the press, the latter being its major emphasis.[10] It has been active and successful in the role of advisor to the federal and land (state) governments on legislation which affects the press, i.e., a right to privacy law, shield law, status of the press in war and other emergencies, revision of the penal law defining treason by publication of state documents, public declaration of press ownership, and an upcoming anti-trust law.

The German Press Council was formed when the licensing of the press during the years following World War II came to an end, at a time when the feder-

al parliament began to talk about passing regulatory legislation. The media themselves felt a Council was necessary if they were to keep the degree of press freedom achieved in the post-war period, and this feeling is the logical source also for the Council's active role in regard to new laws. This Council comes the closest to the British Council in overall activity, carrying out research on press problems and issuing reports (though with a more limited circulation), which then form the basis for future legislation, such as the study of press concentration which led to the new anti-trust law. The Council also issued a "memorandum" in 1970 calling for improved training for journalists.[11,12]

The Austrian Press Council was organized in 1961 and has ten members, all from two professional organizations. The Council releases its opinions to television in cases where they are not published by the newspaper concerned. In 1971 the Council established a Code of Honor, 17 rules of professional conduct which are to serve as basic moral principles, and which are intended to be equally binding on publishers, distributors and journalists.[13]

In some countries total credibility has not been achieved by the press councils, most frequently due to lack of cooperation and the full support of the media themselves. Publicity in the media would seem to be an important aspect of this support, for how well-known the existence and purpose of the council is affects it usefulness. The councils of recent origin include members who represent the public; others have lately added such members. The experience of those councils which have lay members and/or independent chairmen indicates that they have a greater degree of authority with the public. "In many (countries) the idea of lay representatives is infiltrating practically all major disciplinary bodies, including the most reactionary ones, which have often been medicine and the law, and the somewhat sensitive ones, like the police. It is safe to say that this is a general trend which is on the increase, and it may well be only a matter of time before those councils which have so far eschewed the idea

of lay representatives have to concede it."[14]

The press councils can serve the media in criticizing serious malfunctions in balance, as opposed to spurious criticism by individuals with a particular bias. But to function well in this respect the Councils need to carry on an overall surveillance function and be able to initiate complaints themselves. It may be that the very act of surveillance will function to raise the standard of performance. (It should be noted that critics of councils point to this surveillance as a threat to freedom in that it could constitute prior restraint.)

The press ombudsman may be an effective, and eventually necessary, adjunct to the press councils, judging by the Swedish experience, but this office needs to be enlarged if the PO also is to perform a surveillance function in addition to the investigation of complaints. Two press ombudsmen, Lennart Gröll and Ben Bagdikian, with experiences in quite different settings, have expressed this need for expanding the role and function of the PO.[15,16]

ETHICAL CODES

Ethical codes, like press councils, are seen as a protection against interference by politicians. Ethical codes for the behavior of journalists exist in some countries which do not have a press council, and some countries with press councils have no specific national code of ethics. But recent years have seen an increase in the number of formal national codes, and in all cases the standards set by press council opinions and statements represent the general acceptance of well-defined ethical standards. Countries which do not have a national code use a variety of international codes. The Netherlands Press Council, for example, adopted the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) Code; Finland uses both the IFJ and the United Nations International Code of Ethics, along with the Finnish Journalists' Rules and the Finnish Broadcasting

Company's Rules for Program Making.

Sweden first adopted a Code of Ethics in 1923, and an amended form called "Ethical Rules" was adopted in 1974 by both the press organizations and Sveriges Radio. Ethical codes formulated by the press councils, in cooperation with journalists' organizations, have been adopted recently in Austria and West Germany. In four countries--Sweden, Finland, Austria and the Netherlands--the ethical codes also apply to radio and television journalists. In addition to the Code of Honor for the Press, Norway uses "Directives for Reportage of Legal Proceedings," formulated by the Norwegian Press Association, the Norwegian Society of Judges, and the Norwegian Society of Solicitors. The Norwegian Broadcasting Company has its own "Rules for Publishing of Information," which apply to all news services.[17]

One of the objectives of the British Press Council has been to establish ethics for the press, but this it does through its rulings and statements rather than through a formal code. The West German Press Council uses rulings in specific cases to "elaborate" general rules of conduct in such areas as crime reporting, offenses against morals and religion, and the distinction between editorial and advertising material.

CRITICISM AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE BROADCAST MEDIA

Press Councils and the Broadcast Media

At the present time only three of the existing national press councils in the world deal with complaints about radio and television as well as print media--Finland, the Netherlands and the United States. There are two distinct and different views about including the broadcast media in the deliberations of press councils. On one side is the view that abuses of press freedom occur in broadcasting in the same way that they do in the print media, and therefore the journalistic practices in all media should properly be the concern of the same

body. This is seen in both Finland and the Netherlands, and the chairman of the Danish Council hopes to see such a change take place in that Council. In addition, discussions are underway in Switzerland about setting up a press council to deal with all media. On the other side is the opinion that, because broadcasting in most countries is a government monopoly and is regulated by law, it should be examined by a separate body.

The Finnish Broadcasting Company is a parliamentary institution and therefore radio and television are a state monopoly. The Finnish Council for Mass Media, frequently cited as an example of an all media council[18], when judged by demonstrated activity shows slight reason to be so noted. As seen in Table 1, this Council received a total of six complaints about radio and television during the five years between 1969 and 1973.

TABLE 1

Complaints received by the Finnish Council for Mass Media, 1969 through 1973*

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Total complaints received	29	21	32	22	65
Complaints not in jurisdiction	3	3	6	3	2
Complaints received concerned:					
Regular newspapers	24	13	21	15	30
Periodicals	5	4	6	5	19
Local newspapers	-	-	-	-	4
Free distribution papers	-	-	-	-	4
YLE (radio & television)	-	1	2	-	2
MTV (commercial television)	-	-	-	-	1

*Compiled from R. Rydman, "Council for Mass Media: Five Year Statistics," in Round Table on Press Councils, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1974.

It is apparent from this record that Council activity in the area of broadcast media is negligible, as is also the case for most print media outside of regular newspapers. There appear to be a growing number of cases

dealing with the periodical press, a situation seen in other countries also, since this medium has become a prime vehicle for sensational reporting and is therefore the source of many invasion of privacy complaints. It may be that the reason for so few complaints lies with the Council's inability to make its existence well-known,but it is more likely due to the fact that the Finnish Council does not investigate the impartiality of programs, which is an exception to the rule applied to print media. The Council is, in fact, limited in all cases to "matter, manner, and procedure"; that is, errors in fact, the way facts are made public, and the way journalists obtain information.[19]

The Finnish experience raises the question of whether the existing press or media councils will be successful in the area of broadcasting, or whether the special circumstances of the Finnish case are responsible for a considerably less than healthy record. The answer may become more evident as the experiences of other councils in dealing with broadcast media can be assessed.

Legal Structures

The broadcast media have a history basically different from the press, that difference springing from the necessity to regulate and assign frequencies. Nonetheless, in most democratic societies broadcasting is expected to perform according to standards similar to those held for a free press, but with the governments attempting to define these standards rather than the media themselves. In Western European broadcasting companies the functions and administrative structures are established by law. The status of the broadcasting companies vis-a-vis the government varies by country, and also according to personal interpretation. Orjan Wallquist, of Sveriges Radio (SR), sees radio and television not as a state organization, but as a "non-profit company, owned by

by industry, the press and various popular movements."[20] Yet half of the Board of Directors of the company is appointed by the shareholders, while the other half is appointed by the government.

Generally, the financial base for these companies is determined outside the media, with the federal parliaments setting the license fees and controlling the distribution of funds to the various broadcast companies. Wallquist compares the special law governing broadcast activities in Sweden to the Press Act--which guarantees freedom from censorship, access to public documents, and anonymity of sources--but says that in addition the broadcast law stipulates that broadcasting must be "factual" and "impartial".

The broadcasting councils established by law as administrative bodies within the broadcast organizations carry out a kind of legislated protection of individual rights and consumer interests. They represent the political, religious and vocational make-up of the population, or the so-called "interest" groups in a given population. Since they are legal they are accountable through the political process, and therefore are ultimately responsible to the consumers. These councils serve to enforce the legal mandate to serve the public, to protect the public's right to know, and to represent the various elements of the population. Recently there have been some moves to bring the public, the consumer, more directly into the management arena, at least as advisors. In some cases this is seen in the composition of the broadcasting councils, and in two cases, in newly organized bodies.

A Broadcasting Complaints Advisory Committee was established in Ireland in 1974 for the express purpose of hearing complaints. It makes decisions about breaches in the Broadcasting Authority Act, especially relating to the objectivity and impartiality of programming, "matters likely to incite a crime or endanger the security of the state, offend against privacy, or breaches in the advertising code."[21] This Committee is composed of a judge, a journalist and

an independent. Under a proposed amendment to the Irish Broadcasting Law now before Parliament, this non-statutory body would be replaced by a Broadcasting Complaints Commission.

The Austrian Broadcasting Company (ORF) has been operating under a new Broadcasting Act since 1974. Paul Twaroch, General Secretary of ORF, described the new law as ending the company's status as a "limited liability company under civil law," making it instead "an autonomous public entity in affiliation to the government, being a body corporate and legally acting according to commercial law."[22] The innovation in the new Broadcasting Act, however, is the Council of Radio and Television Customers, composed of 35 members, 20 of whom are appointed by the Federal Chancellor to represent various segments of the population. (In practice the Chancellor invites organizations to nominate their own representatives.) The task of this Council is to give advice on matters of programming and technical facilities and to analyze opinion polls to determine the interests of radio and television customers. The Council acts in an advisory capacity only; the Director General simply reports back to the Council within three months on how a recommendation has been carried out, or for what reason it has not. The Council also elects six members of the Board of Trustees and recommends four members for the Control Commission (a body located under the Federal Chancellor's Office, and which functions to enforce the Broadcasting Act), can block increases in license fees for six months, can seek information from the Director General and program and regional managers, and can start a proceeding with the Control Commission in case of an alleged violation of the Broadcasting Act. It would appear that the functions usually carried out by press councils, in the case of Austrian broadcasting, are split between the Control Commission and the Council of Radio and Television Customers. Since objectivity is a mandate contained in the Broadcasting Act, a recent case dealing with the objectivity of a documentary program was handled by the Control Commission.

The Council of Radio and Television Customers has issued six resolutions to date, having to do with the television program schedule and topics. The Council receives complaints directly from the public, the public is invited to attend meetings via announcements in the newspapers, and the press is informed of Council action after each session. After a year of experience with the Council Twaroch feels that two changes are needed--that the 15 members nominated by organizations not be "functionaries or even employees" of those organizations, and that the Council not be allowed to nominate persons from the Council itself for membership on the Board of Trustees, to prevent dual membership on these boards.[23]

Italy

The Italian Parliament adopted new regulations for radio and television in April, 1975. The Constitutional Court had previously cited certain provisions necessary in order to bring the radio and television monopoly into conformity with the Constitution, and these provisions are now included in the new law: "the right to have direct access to broadcast media should be exercised as much as possible, cultural programs should respect society's diverse ideas, anyone who is unfairly hurt by a program should have a 'right of correction,' and relay stations for the reception of foreign programs and local cable television in restricted areas are excluded from the monopoly."[24] In addition, a Parliamentary Committee has the power for both the direction and surveillance of broadcasting services, and regulates the right of correction and access. This Committee is to define the principles for planning programs and their distribution. The new law makes a strict distinction between program and information sections.

The Netherlands

Radio and television programs in the Netherlands are presented by a number of broadcasting organizations and other institutions which have been granted transmission time under the provisions in the broadcasting law (1969) called the "Open Door" Policy.[25] Any group that can prove 40,000 Dutch citizens are either members or supporters can be granted transmission time. The group's initial status gives them one hour of television and three of radio transmission per week; the time usually is used to recruit new members in order to meet the requirement of 100,000 members within two years. If the organization succeeds in this, it gains "Category C" status, with a minimum of 2½ hours of transmission time per week; it if does not succeed, permission to broadcast is withdrawn. There are three categories of broadcasting organizations--A,B and C--all based on membership size, and with a time ratio of 5:3:1. The total money available from license fees and advertising is distributed between the various broadcasting organizations in accordance with the number of broadcasting hours. Contrary to the implied program orientations of religious and political groups, the fare offered must, according to law, be complete in terms of categories of material, such as information, music, theatre, entertainment and science.[26]

In order to achieve cooperation and avoid duplication, the Broadcasting Act calls for joint action wherever possible--in technical facilities and in programs. The Netherlands Broadcasting Foundation (NOS) functions to produce programs, provide facilities to all broadcast organizations, and to manage the general coordination of broadcasting activities, including representation outside of the country. NOS fills about 25 percent of the transmission time, part of which are joint activities, such as news, national and international events, sports and Eurovision programs.

Research and Audience Polling

Research and audience polling is a form of self-regulation carried on by many broadcast companies. In no case is this action spelled out in mandates from governments, yet pressure from consumers is felt through local, state and federal bodies, and the need to move toward satisfying the customer is felt in most systems. Such research and/or audience polling has become institutionalized within the broadcasting companies in most of the Western European countries.

Since January of 1975 the sizes of viewing audiences in West Germany have been measured in all the regions by a new system called Telescopy, in which automatic data collecting instruments placed in 1200 selected households record the length of time the sets are on and to which programs they are tuned. A representative of Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen (ZDF) has described this quantitative viewer analysis as "a turning away from an everything for everyone programming philosophy to a more target group oriented program policy."[27]

Before ZDF revised its basic programming pattern in 1973, both an "empirical investigation of viewers living habits and an analysis of present-day society and its needs in the Federal Republic of Germany" were carried out.[28] It was the intent, in the latter study, to examine the social functions of television within the context of consumer needs. The study resulted in the introduction of more news programs, more political information programs, and an extended range of "guidance" programs (consumer information and how-to's). A major goal, based on the study findings, was to make the total program reflect the conflict of ideas present in the real world. The result of these changes has been greater consumption of news programs, and a general increase in viewing in the early evening. The amount of audience viewing time remained about the same, so it has been concluded that more channel switching and selective viewing is taking place.

In 1975 the Norwegian Broadcasting Company (NRK) formalized its activities in the area of research by creating a new position specifically for initiating and supervising research and as a liaison between NRK and other research institutions. The budget for research has grown from about $20,000 in 1969 to $140,000 in 1975. Between 40 to 50 percent of the 1975 budget for research supports research projects at Norwegian universities, and about 25 percent is used for listener-viewer studies carried out by the Central Bureau of Statistics.[29]

Sveriges Radio carries on an extensive media research program. The SR Audience and Program Research Department budget for fiscal 1975/76 is $1,225,000, and it has a working staff of 86 people.[30] Research carried out by this group includes not only audience polling for program and schedule responses, but also projects designed to obtain basic information about the communication process. One continuing study, "Man as a Receiver of Information," is now in its third phase, dealing with how various sound and picture combinations affect the ability of the receiver to perceive, understand and evaluate a message transmitted via broadcast media.[31]

Several studies are underway related to "information gaps," situations in which some groups within a society seem to be disadvantaged in terms of access to and use of information necessary for their own participation in that society, and the role of mass media in contributing to or helping to solve such problems. The results of these research projects are intended to affect the goals of broadcast policies, and therefore of programming. A similar group of projects, i.e., Citizens' Information Needs, are being carried on by the Finnish Broadcasting Company.[32]

Beginning in 1968, the Swiss Broadcasting Company (SBC) started continuous program and public opinion studies for television through a private company, but in 1974 took over this activity itself. In 1975 continuous listener-viewer

polling was begun using in-depth interviews in place of telephone polling, with the emphasis on program quality. SBC has a public opinion research department which interprets all data and operates in an advisory capacity on all public opinion and media research questions. SBC has been undergoing an administrative restructuring, expected to be completed at the end of 1975, intended to increase efficiency and to make it "more responsive to society."[33]

Nicholas Garnham, writing about British television, says that audience research in that country has now largely become a matter of schedule response; that scheduling has demonstrated that size of audience delivered and quality of programs are only minimally related.[34] This bears out the broadly expressed feeling in many Western European broadcasting systems that television has reached a kind of saturation point, in terms of audience coverage, audience viewing time and kinds of programs. In the future Garnham sees still more variations in already produced kinds of programs, a greater orientation of programs toward segments of the audience, and still more finely tuned schedule adjustments.

Public Inquiries

Public inquiries have preceded most major policy changes within the broadcasting organizations of Western Europe, as was the case, for example, with the new Austrian Broadcasting Act of 1974. The public inquiry system is used in Great Britain, Sweden and West Germany as well, and is a common avenue leading to public policy decisions. These inquiries constitute pre-decision making investigations of performance related to future policy possibilities, taking into account the economic and technological resources of the particular country. Whether regularly constituted, as in Great Britain and Sweden, or created for special purposes, as in Austria and West Germany, they serve to watchdog the media.

Both Great Britain and Sweden have a system of regular review which comes about every ten years, and for broadcasting is associated with the renewal of the mandates to the broadcasting companies by Parliament. Public inquiries in Britain also brought forward the initial recommendations for a press council, and were the forerunners of later changes in the Council as well (enlarging the size and composition and providing for the selection of lay members by an independent commission). The findings and reports of these inquiries, in addition to those of the British Press Council, have brought attention to the needs of media and to the need for protection of basic human rights. In Britain today, the so-called Annan Commission is charged with looking at broadcasting up through the end of the 1980s.

The public inquiry in West Germany (the Commission on the Development of the Telecommunications System in the Federal Republic of Germany), undertaken in 1974, was stimulated by the need of government to make decisions related to new and expected technological developments. This Commission was to study "the development of old and new telecommunication services, with particular respect to teleprocessing and cable television, and to make proposals for a socially desirable and economically reasonable telecommunication system of the future."[35] It examined existing telecommunication services, new services over existing networks, broadband one-way distribution networks, and two-way switched broadband networks. In the final report, issued in January of this year, the Commission favored development of existing networks, and indicated it feels that the importance of broadband networks has been over-estimated; it gives highest priority to development of the telephone system.[36]

In 1975, 95 percent of the West German population had a radio and/or a television set, while only 54 percent of private households had a telephone. Based on an average of 30 local calls per month, the cost of a telephone was $79

(not including installation), while radio-television license fees were $50 in that same year (based on an exchange rate of DM 2.5 per dollar). Commission member Hans Bausch has stated that the Commission received survey results which found that consumers want more radio and television programs, including local information and public access channels, but he believes "the time budget of the working population is as defined as their financial budget for communication expenses. Media use is very constant in our country, the daily listening, reading and viewing time did not change since television reached a high saturation."[37] In spite of the surveys, the Commission decided there was no great need for local radio and television programs, or for a larger number of television programs, apparently wishing to interpret more programs as more time spent viewing, rather than more choice for consumers. Both the First Program (ARD) and Second Program (ZDF) transmitted an average of 55-57 hours per week in 1975, and the Third Program considerably less[38], sometimes closing down transmission during the summer months, as did Westdeutscher Rundfunk (Cologne) in 1975. (There are no local programs in Germany except for some recent access experiments.)

A public inquiry in broadcasting takes place every ten years in Sweden. Sveriges Radio recently completed its own study of the first five years with two television channels, hoping to delay or cancel the official inquiry, but failed in this effort. Broadcasting in Sweden includes two television channels and local radio where there is one or no local newspaper. The SR study indicated that while television viewing has not increased substantially since the second channel was introduced, the two channel system functions to increase the viewing options of the public.[39] Coordination between the two channels protects program choices, and in this sense competition between them is not free; similar program types do not occur in the same time slot, and therefore the viewer is offered more options.

The two channel system in Sweden developed an organization which used a centralized service for news, supervision of program purchases and sales and for formulating personnel policies within the corporation. In other ways the two channels were independent. The SR study concluded that this dual organization costs about 11 million Skr. ($2.5 million) more than an integrated system.[40]

Even with the successes demonstrated so far in the use of the public inquiry system, the problems of assessing consumer thinking remains. "In the UK, the Annan Commission has received 6000 letters from viewers (as well as 650 documents from individuals and interested groups) and found itself faced with a task of analysis which still left it feeling that the viewer had perhaps not been adequately consulted."[41]

While these inquiries are in process there is extensive public and professional discussion about what is wrong with programming and what changes are needed, a sort of public debate between television people and listeners, conducted via letters, commentaries and articles appearing in a variety of media. This has been the case in Great Britain during the past year.[42] The essence of the discussion there has been that the public wants more from television than it is getting. In the case of news, they want more than "objectivity" and "balance," they want analysis, explanation and perspective.

Access Movements

There are strong pressures in most of the industrialized countries for both individual citizen and organization access to broadcasting. Failure to inform is one of the arguments brought by various groups for access to these media, and may be defined as the unobjective treatment of a topic through insufficient or omitted coverage. The failure to inform concept also is behind the pressure for balance in kinds of programs, i. e., serious versus light, in the overall schedule. Where multiple channels exist within one broadcasting

company there is a general goal of balance in kinds of programs transmitted. This is seen, for example, between BBC1 and BBC2, which take a "complementary posture,"[43] and in Sveriges Radio, where various kinds of programs are scheduled in such a way as to increase viewing options rather than in direct competition. Consideration of increasing the number of channels, therefore, raises questions about changes which may influence the whole system.

Although the right of reply has been considered by some as strictly a question of access to a specific medium, while press councils are more concerned with the protection of human rights[44], a more commonly accepted interpretation is that access is a basic right as defined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN 1948), which states that, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers."

Brian Winston, writing in the BBC's The Listener, sees the demands for access as due to a disenchantment among those regularly exposed on television "with the medium's ability to let them get their points across without distortion," and to a desire for greater participation in all aspects of politics.[45] A variety of approaches to satisfying this desire for access have been tried in Western Europe.[46] Most of these have been a sort of partnership in which the broadcasting company offers facilities and help for filming, and may even advance ideas of particular interest to specific groups or localities.

Another fairly recent development, and perhaps a spin-off from access movements, is the rise of grassroots consumer groups who want to affect program offerings. Dieter Stolte, the new program director for ZDF in West Germany, finds a basic dissatisfaction in television audiences, and believes a "television crisis" exists which has its roots in this dissatisfaction.[47] In

Germany so-called viewer associations have sprung up in recent years, and have in a very short time gained thousands of members. These organizations have petitioned the broadcasting organizations with a variety of criticisms about programs and "secret" policy decisions. One stated goal of the Berlin association was to see that "real viewers" would become members of the television boards, not just "prominent personalities."

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

All over Western Europe, including those nations with opinion presses, adherence to the standard of objectivity--defined as accuracy combined with a balance of viewpoints--has brought about changes which have resulted in a kind of central tendency in press performance, a phenomenon in no little way aided by the large international news agencies. Where economic restrictions contribute to reliance on the international wire services, as in many of the smaller countries, the mass media may rely on these alone for international news. Broadcasting systems, particularly, depend largely on wire services for both international and national news. Since greater capital makes a separate news gathering network possible, some concentration of ownership in the media could contribute to lessening this dependence on wire services, and thereby expand the expressed viewpoints rather than narrow them.

It would appear that failure to inform needs to be viewed as a multifaceted phenomenon, not just as a problem associated with concentration of ownership. Many and various power groups can be seen to exert influence, through the control of advertising revenue, for instance, which then may result in failure to inform on the part of the influenced medium. Failure to provide fair, balanced, accurate and <u>adequate</u> news reporting, when viewed as failure to inform, abridges individual rights and therefore falls under the proper aegis

of press councils, most of whose prime function is the protection of those rights. It is failure to inform, too, which comprises the basic strength of pressures brought by various groups within society for access to the mass media. A case in point is seen in West Germany, where the government commission had evidence that consumers want more local information programs and public access channels, yet the commission failed to make recommendations to satisfy these stated desires. Still another side of failure to inform can be seen in the complaints of journalists about decisions within their own newspapers against printing certain stories. Both the Norwegian Union of Journalists and the Danish Journalists' Union have expressed interest in pursuing the question of failure to inform.

In spite of the changes and developments detailed here (a summary of which is contained in Table 2), there are growing complaints and dissatisfactions heard about media in all countries, and whatever means are available for attending to these criticisms without undermining the basic requirements for press freedom must be given attention by the media; otherwise media professionals themselves will be the handmaidens in limiting the very freedom they claim to be defending. In addition to some of the mechanisms examined here, it would seem reasonable to support an effort in two other areas: 1) to educate audiences to accept the idea that they will not like or be interested in everything they can see and hear, and that they must take most of the responsibility for monitoring the information and entertainment they admit to their own environments; and at the same time, 2) to develop mechanisms for achieving some regular feedback to and pressure on the mass media, which informs about needs and wants in order to both maintain the freedom of the media and to bring about voluntary responsible behavior toward those expressed wants and needs.

Hope for stopping short of government control and regulated mass media may lie in some of the voluntary mechanisms described here, but also perhaps in

the growing sentiment for the unification of Europe and the international bodies which are already at work, such as the European Economic Community, the Council of Europe and the United Nations. While their existence may hold the potential framework for international control, they also extend the concept of basic human rights to countries whose national charters do not contain such protections, and these organizations hold the only presently foreseeable possibility for protecting those rights. Under the sponsorship of these organizations, it is possible for people from both governments and the media to come together to work on common problems.

One example of this working together is related to the new satellites and the possibility for direct broadcasting from outer space into individual home receivers. Through this development the international problem of freedom of information has acquired new dimensions, and ethical obligations create the necessity for united action to formulate an international code of ethics.[48]

Another relates to the economic pressures on the press. British IPI Board member Windsor Clarke points to the number of cases in Europe where the press is dependent on governments for some form of economic assistance, and while recognizing this may be a necessity, in the interests of press freedom he suggests that a broader system than national support for national newspapers needs to be developed. He sees the already existing international organizations as a means for creating a "European level" support system, which could make political manipulation of such support in any one country almost impossible.[49]

It is possible that we are witnessing in part the expression of a general dissatisfaction the consumer feels about his ability to participate in affairs that influence and shape his life, in an environment which grows more and more complex but about which he is informed in ever greater measure by mass media, a wider dissatisfaction that is masked by overt dissatisfaction

with the media themselves. At the 1975 Annual Assembly of the IPI, Secretary General of the Council of Europe Georg Kahn-Ackermann spoke of the new and dangerous challenges to our democratic societies and institutions, and said, "The profession of journalism has to be exercised with more responsibility towards the pluralistic society as a whole than might have been necessary 25 years ago. ...There is the new phenomenon of terrorism and the revival of anarchism, and freedom of expression is contested in our society. ...we should not overlook the fact that most governments and political forces in our part of the world rate peace higher than freedom..." [50]

When the press is viewed as having an adversary relationship with government then no more than an "uneasy peace" should be expected, but the goal of accurate and adequate information offered to the people may be more likely in the presence of such institutions as press councils and press ombudsmen. The broadcast media, having never been in a position to voluntarily create any self-disciplinary mechanisms seem to be showing some awareness and adherence to larger principles than those residing in specific legal mandates. It may be that out of the trials and errors of international agreements, organizations and personal exchanges, and the growing climate for working together, will come the most fruitful mechanisms for protecting the rights and freedoms under attack today.

TABLE 2

Summary of major developments detailed in the text.

	PRINT										BROADCAST			
	New press or media council	Revisions of existing press council	Consumer representatives added or increased in number	Sanctions strengthened	Membership increased	Press ombudsman	Discussion of reform in press council	Discussion about creating press council	Press council includes all media		Consumer complaints body	New legislation or regulation relating to access or right of reply	Increased activity in audience polling and/or research	Public inquiries
Austria	1961										1974			1974
Denmark	1964	1968					*				1974			
France								X						
Finland	1968								X				X	
Great Britain			X		X						1971		X	*
Ireland								X			1974			
Italy												1975		
Netherlands		1960	X		X		*		X		1968	1968		
Norway		1972	X	X	X								X	
Sweden		1969	X	X	X	X					1967		X	*
Switzerland													X	
West Germany													X	1976

*in progress

REFERENCES

1 John Merrill, "Frightening to see low esteem of the press--a US view," IPI Report, 24:8 (August, 1975) p. 1.

2 "What's Freedom of the Press?" Sweden Now, 7:2, 1973. pp. 42-44.

3 Jan M. deMeij, Freedom and Responsibility of the Press. A study of the press council in relation to freedom of information. English summary . (Utrecht: Stichting L.S.B., 1975.) pp. 273-76. Published dissertation, University of Utrecht.

4 Round Table on Press Councils, Stockholm, 26-27 September 1974. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1974.) p. 5.

5 J. Clement Jones, "Background Paper on Press Councils," prepared for Collective Consultations on Mass Media Councils, in Paris, 3-4 October 1974. (Paris: UNESCO, #FFE/2336/16.10.74)

6 Lennart Gröll, "The Press Ombudsman in Sweden," Grassroots Editor, May/June 1973. pp. 13-15.

7 Round Table on Press Councils, Section II. (Except where noted otherwise, statutes of other press councils are taken from the compilation of statutes presented in Section II of this document.)

8 R. Rydman, "The Finnish Council for the Mass Media," Round Table on Press Councils, pp. 74-84.

9 Helga Pedersen, private communication, 28 November 1975.

10 John C. Merrill, Carter R. Bryan and Marvin Alisky, The Foreign Press, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970. p. 141.

11 Heinz Dietrich Fischer, in Round Table on Press Councils, pp. 31-33.

12 Press Councils and Press Codes, (Zurich: International Press Institute, 1966.) pp. 19-24.

13 "Austrian Press Code Combats Freedom Abuse," IPI Report, 21:3 (March, 1972) p. 11.

14 J. Clement Jones, op. cit., p. 19.

15 Lennart Gröll, op. cit.

16 Ben Bagdikian, "The Saga of a Newspaper Ombudsman," in Michael C. Emery and Ted Curtis Smythe, eds., Readings in Mass Communication. (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1974), pp. 74-77.

17 Press Councils and Press Codes, Part II, and Round Table on Press Councils, Section II.

18 Kenneth Starck, "Needed: Two-Headed Watchdogs," Grassroots Editor, Jan/Feb. 1973,pp. 24-27.

19 R. Rydman, op. cit.

20 "What's Freedom of the Press?" p. 42.

21 Leon O Broin, "Amending Irish Broadcasting Law," EBU Review, XXVI:5, (Sept., 1975), pp. 39-41.

22 Paul Twaroch, "The Austrian Broadcasting Act of 1974: Effects of the new legal situation on the Austrian Broadcasting Company," paper presented at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the International Broadcast Institute in Cologne, West Germany.

23 Private communication, 17 November 1975.

24 "Italy: After 15 years a new law," Intermedia, 3:1, pp. 25-26, August 1975.

25 NOS Information, 1975. (Hilversum, NL) pp.1-6.

26 Hans Schaafsma, "Mirror of a Pillarized Society: Broadcasting in the Netherlands," Delta, 9:4, (Winter 1967), pp. 57-65.

27 Bernward Frank, "Audience Research Related to Practice," EBU Review, XXVII:1 (Jan., 1976), pp. 14-16.

28 Dieter Schwarzenau, "After the Structural Reform: Back to the Programmes," EBU Review, XXVI:6 (Nov., 1975), p. 18.

29 Mie Berg, "Survey of NRK's Engagement in Radio and TV Research," (Oslo: Norsk Rikskringkasting, 1975).

30 Elisabeth Kessens-Ågren, Sveriges Radio, private communication, 22 July 1975.

31 "Schematic Project Descriptions," (Stockholm: Sveriges Radio, 1974/75), pp. 19-20.

32 Kaarle Nordenstreng, "From Mass Media to Mass Consciousness: Current Thinking in Scandinavia," in Approaching Mass Media Education through Communication Research. (University of Tampere, Finland: Institute of Journalism and Mass Communication, 1974), pp. 33-54.

33Markus T. Drack, "Radio and Television in Switzerland," (Berne: Swiss Broadcasting Corporation, 1974), p. 14.

34 Nicholas Garnham, Structures of Television, BFI Television Monograph. London: British Film Institute, 1973.

35 Hans Bausch, "The Commission for the Development of the Telecommunication System for the Federal Republic of Germany," paper presented to the 1975 Annual Meeting of the IBI in Cologne.

36 "German Commission Favours Existing, Narrowband Networks," Intermedia, 4:1, (Feb., 1976) pp. 15-16.

37 Bausch, op.cit., p. 7.

38 Computed from Horzü, a weekly television program guide magazine, for the week of December 13-19, 1975.

39 "The Two-Channel System in Television," report of the Swedish Radio study, in Media Forsk Orienterer, No. 19N, December 1975.

40 Jan-Otto Modig, "The Swedish television system" EBU Review, XXVII;1, (Jan., 1976) pp. 11-14.

41 Report of Working Committee III, 1975 Annual Meeting of the IBI, Cologne.

42 See for example, Peter Fiddick, "TV News: Wider Still and Wider?" The Listener, 16 October 1975, pp. 492; "TV News: A bias Against Understanding," Intermedia, 3:3, pp. 18-19, December 1975 (reprinted from The Times); and "Television Journalism: the Great Debate," EBU Review, XXVII:1, (Jan., 1976) pp. 26-27.

43 "How Many Channels Do We Need?" Intermedia, 4:1, (Feb. 1976), p. 28.

44 Jan deMeij, in Round Table on Press Councils, p. 17.

45 "The problem of access," The Listener, 18 Sept., 1975, p. 377.

46 Frances Berrigan, Access and the Media--New Models in Europe. (London: Middlesex Polytechnic, 1974.)

47 Dieter Stolte, "Learning to Live With Television," EBU Review, XXV:2, pp. 32-33.

48 Hilding Eek, "New ethical obligations: necessity of united action and international code of ethics at national and international level," Journalisme, No. 41. (Conference in Strasbourg, France, in 1972.)

49 "Institute Affairs," IPI Report, 24:7, (July 1975), p. 5.

50 "Hiding the truth under mountains of facts," IPI Report, 24:7 (July 1975), p.1.